

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed January 18, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, FIG 1 has been amended to extend the line from reference numeral 18 to the center of the polygon 16 shown as an 'x' in compliance with the specification and the rest of the figures, such as FIG 2, and page 6, line 20 of the specification. Further, FIG 3 has been amended to change reference numeral 46 to 47, since a duplicate reference numeral 46 is already shown in FIG 2 for a different element, namely, the virtual deflection point within the polygon 16, as recited on page 9, line 8 of the specification. The specification has also been amended to refer to the magnifying tracking lens by reference numeral 47. Applicant respectfully request approval of the enclosed proposed replacement sheets including FIGs 1 and 3.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which

better conforms to U.S. practice. Further, the specification has been amended to correct certain informalities.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1 and 3-15 have been amended for better conformance to U.S. practice, such as beginning the dependent claims with 'The' instead of 'A', and changing "characterized in that" to --wherein--. Claims 1 and 3-15 were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicant respectfully reserves all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification for lacking headings. Applicant respectfully declines to add the headings as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a). Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,543,825 (Fisli). Further, claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Fisli. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-17 are patentable over Fisli for at least the following reasons.

Fisli is directed to a raster output scanner 80, shown in FIG

3, having a single-channel acoustic-optic cell 58 that deflects multiple beams from laser diodes 50, each with a dedicated driver 52. As recited on column 4, lines 48-50, facet tracking ensures that the beams stay centered on the facet throughout all positions in which the facet reflects light to a photoreceptor 78.

It is respectfully submitted that Fisli does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 16, which amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the tracking means are operable to create a deflection point for the scanning beam, said deflection point being located between a center of rotation of the rotatable polygon mirror and the facet upon which the at least one primary radiation beam is momentarily incident.


These features are nowhere taught or suggested in Fisli. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 16 is allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-15 and 17 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 16.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or

averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
March 26, 2007

Enclosure: Replacement drawing sheets (2 sheet including FIGs 1 and 3) and Annotated Sheets Showing Changes
New Abstract

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101